

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JOSEPH PEREZ,

Plaintiff

v.

CHARLES DANIELS, *et al.*,

Defendants

Case No. 2:21-cv-01343-GMN-NJK

**ORDER**

On July 19, 2021, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402 filing fee on or before September 17, 2021. (ECF No. 3). The September 17, 2021 deadline has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, paid the full \$402 filing fee, or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey

1 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
2 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
3 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
4 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
5 *See Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at  
6 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

7 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously  
8 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of  
9 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
10 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay  
11 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. *See Anderson v. Air*  
12 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring  
13 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
14 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
15 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
16 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779  
17 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file a fully complete application to  
18 proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402 filing fee on or before September 17, 2021  
19 expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, if Plaintiff does not file a fully  
20 complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with all three documents or pay the full  
21 \$402 filing fee for a civil action on or before September 17, 2021, this case will be subject  
22 to dismissal without prejudice for Plaintiff to refile the case with the Court, under a new  
23 case number, when Plaintiff is has all three documents needed to file a complete  
24 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pays the the full \$402 filing fee." (ECF No. 3  
25 at 3). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would result from  
26 noncompliance with the Court's order to file a fully complete application to proceed *in*  
27 *forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402 filing fee on or before September 17, 2021.

28 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is dismissed without prejudice

1 based on Plaintiff's failure to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*  
2 or pay the full \$402 filing fee in compliance with this Court's order dated July 19, 2021.  
3 (ECF No. 3).

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court will close the case and enter  
5 judgment accordingly. No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case.

6 DATED: Sept. 27, 2021

7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 GLORIA M. NAVARRO  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28